

### REMARKS

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following representations, reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 and 10 are pending in the present application.

On page 2 of Office Action the Examiner objected to claim 2 because of a repetitive claim limitation from claim 1. Claim 2 was amended to delete the repetitive phrasing.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for insufficient antecedent basis. Applicant has amended claim 3 to correct this deficiency. Additionally, claim 3 was amended to correct an ambiguity regarding the claim element “distance.” Distance is exemplified by image element d2, where d2 is the shortest distance between the line L1a and the journal part across a middle axis of the bearing body. Support for amended claim 3 can be found at lines 21-24 of page 34 of the application and in FIG 11.

The Examiner also rejected claim 4 on the same basis as claim 3. Applicant has amended claim 4 to provide proper antecedent basis. The amendment does not constitute new matter.

The Examiner rejected claim 5 as lacking proper antecedent basis. Additionally, the Examiner felt that the limitations recited were unclear. Applicant has amended claim 5 for clarity and to provide a proper antecedent basis for the claim elements.

The Examiner rejected claim 10 as being indefinite. The Examiner suggested that Applicant amend claim 10 to recite “formed by” in the recitation of claim limitations. Applicant acknowledges and thanks the Examiner for his suggestion. Applicant has amended the claims in keeping with the Examiner’s suggestion.

No new matter was added to any of the claims to overcome the rejection of claims 2-5 and 10.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tanaka, US PUB 2002/0001420 (Tanaka).

Claim 1 points out patentable subject matter by disclosing an oil impregnated sintered bearing where the inner wall of the enlarged diameter portions of the bearing have higher sintering density than the enlarged diameter portions. Claim 1 further describes an invention wherein the cavities exposed on an inner surface of the enlarged diameter portion have smaller size and density than those of cavities exposed on an inner surface of the journal part.

Claim 1 provides for a bearing having a shaft. When a large torque is exerted to rotate the shaft, the rotating shaft tends to be deflected because of large shear load. In such a case, the lubricating oil that is seeped from the relatively porous inner wall of the journal part is not impregnated into the relatively dense inner wall of the enlarged diameter part, and thus takes on the role of suppressing deviations in the rotation axis of the shaft (*See* line 9 on page 19 to line 22 on page 20).

On the other hand, the sintered bearing of Tanaka comprise a cylindrical bearing body having a first portion and a second portion, the second portion having an inner periphery and a *non-porous slide member* (21), which may be made of resinous material. This is disposed at the inner periphery of said second portion of the present invention [¶¶[0010]-[0011]]. As shown in FIG. 3, the non-porous slide member covers both of cylindrical middle portion (journal part) and expanding portion (enlarged diameter part). As described in ¶[0033], the second slide surface (22) of the slide member (21) extends over an axial length of the bearing (15).

On the other hand, Tanaka fails to point out that the cavities exposed on an inner surface of the enlarged parts are of a smaller size and lower density than those of cavities exposed on an inner surface of the journal part.

Therefore, Tanaka fails to point out each and every limitation found in amended claim 1. As such, the rejection under 102(b) has been overcome and should be withdrawn. Additionally, claims

2-3, 5 and 10 all depend from claim 1. In light of the arguments presented regarding claim 1, it is submitted that claims 2-3, 5 and 10 are similarly not anticipated.

On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka, USP PGPub 2002/0001420.

Claims 4 and 6 are dependent on claims 1 and 5 respectively. Applicant points out that the Examiner has not rejected claims 1 or 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Therefore, in light of the arguments made with respect to the novelty of claim 1, claims 4 and 6 can not be rendered obvious. Tanaka fails, alone or in combination to recite the complete subject matter found in claims 1 and 4 or claims 5 and 6. As such, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is moot and should be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above discussion, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejections have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: March 18, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Melvin C. Garner  
Registration No.: 26,272  
DARBY & DARBY P.C.  
P.O. Box 770  
Church Street Station  
New York, New York 10008-0770  
(212) 527-7700  
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)  
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant